

REMARKS

The examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-34, 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,085,238 to Yuasa et al.

The examiner also rejected claims 10, 24 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,238 to Yuasa et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,006 to Rasanen.

Amended claim 1 includes the features of “accepting a segment of data from a host system, a portion of the segment identifying a broadcast domain, comparing the portion ... with an identifier for a selected broadcast domain; and excluding the segment of data from transmission from the host system based on the comparison.”

With regard to the rejection over Yuasa , the examiner stated:

As per claims 1, 17, 27 and 38, Yuasa et al teaches a method comprising: accepting a segment of data from a host system (See col. 9, lines 15-25), a portion of the segment identifying a broadcast domain (See col. 26, lines 45-62, the filter controls broadcast or multicasts(filtering); comparing the portion with an identifier for a selected broadcast domain (See col. 26, lines 63-67, col. 27, lines 1-15 and col. 34, lines 49-62, the VLAN control section collates the V/AN-ID tag of the received multiplexed data with the VLAN table for sorting the data to microsegment s); and filtering the segment from a network connection based on the comparison (See col. 36, lines 40-49).

Amended claim 1 recites “excluding the segment of data from transmission from the host system.” Claims 17, 27 and 38 have been similarly amended. Applicant contends that Yuasa et al neither describes nor suggests the claimed feature of excluding. Yuasa et al “filter[s] packets” between an “intranet segment” and an “internet segment.” (col. 36, lns. 42-46). However, Yuasa does not “exclud[e]” packets “from transmission from the host system.”

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Claims 10, 24 and 35 are allowable over Yuasa et al whether taken separately or in combination with Rasanen, at for the reasons discussed in claim 1 and because Rasanen does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Yuasa.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant : Thomas M. Slaight
Serial No. : 10/741,533
Filed : December 19, 2003
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-916001 / P17368

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2007

/Denis G. Maloney/
Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906